



263  
891

Further Facts For Farmers.

22682

---

# EXPORTS

—OF—

# FARM PRODUCTS

(Includes Agricultural Produce and Animals  
and their Produce.)

---

1896,	-	-	\$50,591,002.
1900,	-	-	\$83,665,416.
1903,	-	-	\$114,441,863.

1904

0 909559

## Up to 1900.

The record of the Laurier Government before the farmers of Canada, as shown by the administration of the Department of Agriculture, was completely endorsed in the elections of 1900.

The main items of that administration then before the public were :

The establishment of a complete chain of cold storage transportation from the farm in Canada to the consumer in Great Britain ;

The removal of the cattle quarantine restrictions between the United States and Canada ;

The enactment of the San José Scale Act, for the protection of our orchards against that insidious pest ;

The inauguration of the distribution of agricultural information to the farmers ;

The appointment of a practical agriculturist to manage the tillage and live stock at the Central Experimental Farm ;

The appointment of a Live Stock Commissioner to deal with the varied interests of live stock production and management in Canada.

THE SYSTEM OF COLD STORAGE TRANSPORTATION provided refrigerator chambers at the creameries ; refrigerator car service to carry perishable products to the seaboard ; the establishment of cold storage warehouses at the chief points of export ; the provision on the ocean-going vessels of efficient mechanical cold storage chambers.

By reason of these improvements, Canadian butter and other perishable products could be laid down in the British market in good condition ; the result was an immediate advance in the position of these Canadian products in the English market, where before Danish, Australian and New Zealand butter stood considerably higher than Canadian butter ; Canadian butter advanced to the second place, running the Danish pretty hard in the race

Tender fruits were shipped and successfully sold on the English market, which the Canadian producer never had been able before to do.

The Canadian farmer, by this work of the Laurier Government, was given the same advantages as his competitors in other lands. Before 1896 Australia, New Zealand and the United States had first-class cold storage facilities for landing their perishable products in England. The Tory Government had failed to provide these for the Canadian farmer, and it was left to the present Liberal Government to inaugurate this service.

## Abolished the Quarantine.

The quarantine of ninety days upon all cattle entering the United States from Canada before 1897 practically prohibited any export to that country. The Tories had deplored this, but said nothing could be done.

Hon. Sydney Fisher, the Minister of Agriculture, took a trip to Washington, and in a week swept away this quarantine obstruction. The immediate result was an increase in the export of Canadian cattle to the United States. In the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1896, we exported to them 1,645 head, valued at \$8,870. For the next six months, to December 31st, the export was 577 head, at \$9,717. The abolition of the quarantine took effect one month afterwards, on February 1st. For the six months ending June 30th, 1897, after the abolition had been effective for five months, we exported 35,421 head, valued at \$499,421. The fiscal year, ended 30th June, 1898, our export was 87,905 head, valued at \$1,239,448, the price in the latter year being \$14 per head against \$5.39 in 1896, an increase in price of \$8.61 per head. The exports, during the seven years previous to the abolition, 1890-1896, amounted to \$195,814; during the following seven years, ending June 30th, 1903, they totalled \$6,419,385.

In the distribution of agricultural knowledge, the first steps were taken and the foundations laid on which, in the last four years, immense strides have been made which will be detailed in succeeding pages.

## Cool Curing of Cheese.

During the last few years much reckless criticism of the Minister of Agriculture has been indulged in. An abundant opportunity for formal indictment was afforded during the last session of Parliament, but only two attacks were made; one by Mr. Taylor, the Tory member for Leeds and Grenville, the chief whip of the Opposition, on July the 27th; the other by Mr. E. D. Smith, M. P. for Wentworth, on July 29th.

It may be fairly inferred that, with the exception of the points brought out in these attacks, the Opposition have no complaints to make to the farmers of Canada against the Laurier Government.

Mr. Taylor's criticism was based on the expenditure for the establishment of illustration cool curing stations for cheese making.

Canadian cheese has always been sold on the English market at from one to three cents a pound less than the best Old Country cheddar. The experts of the Agricultural Department have been for years studying the reasons for this, and were convinced that the curing of Canadian cheese in varying and high temperature was one of the chief causes. Small experiments were carried

on for several years, which proved conclusively that cheese cured at a temperature of from 60 to 65 degrees was better in quality, and shrunk less, than cheese cured in the ordinary ill-constructed curing-rooms of the average factory.

To show this on a large scale, central curing rooms, to each of which the cheese of from twelve to fifteen factories could be brought to be cured under the best conditions, were established. This required a considerable outlay of money, but the results have well repaid the outlay.

This season a price for the Government cool-cured cheese has been established at several of the cheese boards in the neighborhood of these curing-rooms; and this cheese has been sold at from one-eighth to one-quarter of a cent a pound, in the open market, higher than the ruling price for other finished cheese. Last year 234,000,000 pounds of cheese were shipped to the English market. One-eighth of a cent per pound on this would make \$292,500, or nearly \$300,000. If Canadian cheese makers had applied the illustrations at these Government stations, at least this amount of \$300,000 would have been added to the farmers' receipts. So successful has the illustration been that a considerable number of private factories have improved their curing-rooms, and demands have come to the Department from all over the country for the establishment of similar central curing-rooms!

The only question to be still proved is whether central curing-rooms for a number of factories, or the improvement of the curing-rooms at individual factories, is the more practical method of attaining the end desired.

Some minor experiments, including the paraffining of cheese, were tried at the central curing-rooms. The Department of Agriculture is continually experimenting in connection with all its work. Mr. Taylor's statement was that paraffining had been a great hurt and a loss to the factory men whose cheese has been so treated. As a matter of fact, all the cheese sold this season at the above mentioned price was paraffined, and instead of a loss, the factory men whose cheese was thus treated made a gain of from one-eighth to three-sixteenths of a cent a pound on their cheese.

Some English buyers have been suspicious of this new method of treating the cheese, but many others have praised it and eagerly take all the paraffined cheese they can get.

An additional expenditure has been made on behalf of the cheese industry in the arrangement of cool ventilated chambers in the ships for the carriage of cheese to Great Britain; and specially constructed ventilated cars for the transport of the cheese on the Canadian railways. These have been largely availed of and have proven a great improvement in the carriage of this valuable product.

This improvement has been brought about in the course of the last two years by the action of the Department of Agriculture.

So much for the criticism in regard to the work done for the benefit of the cheese industry.

The Canadian farmers exported last year \$24 184 566 worth of cheese. The Minister of Agriculture believes that the expenditure of a few thousand dollars a year to discover any improvements in either the manufacture or the transportation of this product is well spent in the interests of the dairymen of Canada. Do these object? Will they endorse the carping and unfounded statements of one of the leading Conservative members of the House?

### Steamship Cold Storage.

On July 29<sup>th</sup> last, Mr. E. D. Smith, M. P., moved a vote of censure on the Government because the cold storage accommodation in the ships was not what he, as a fruit exporter, thought it ought to be. He based his remarks on the records of the thermographs placed in the cold storage chambers of the ships leaving Montreal, in the season of 1903.

He had free access to these records early in the session, and apparently studied them for several months. He had abundant opportunity at an earlier date of bringing this question forward. He deliberately chose the week during which he knew the Minister of Agriculture to be absent from the House attending the Dominion Exhibition in Winnipeg. He then went into elaborate details, quoting from these records to prove that the temperature in which butter was carried from Canada to England was too high.

The documents from which he took his proof were the thermograph records, showing the temperature in certain chambers in certain named vessels sailing at certain named dates. On the face of the thermograph record, along with the tracing of the temperature during the whole voyage, is stencilled the number of the chamber and the character of the products stored in it. In examining these records, nobody could see the tracing of the temperature without at the same time clearly seeing the statement of the products. It is hardly conceivable, but it is a fact, that Mr. Smith quoted as the temperatures of chambers in which butter was stored a number of records of chambers in which fruit was stored. He denounced the cold storage system because the temperature in these chambers ranged from 34 to 50 degrees, saying that it ought to be 20, or lower.

The temperatures quoted, ranging from 34 to 50, are the proper temperatures for fruit carriage. The fruit would have been destroyed in those chambers had the temperature been at the figure Mr. Smith said it ought to have been!



The burden of his criticism was based on these mis-quotations and mis-statements of the facts. In some of these cases the temperature varied somewhat, but in most of them the temperature was within a few degrees of what the products carried in the chamber required.

In his speech, he stated over and over again that the butter was put into these chambers at such and such a temperature. There is no record of the temperature of the butter when it was put into the chamber; the record is only the record of the temperature of the chamber itself; and in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred that temperature, at the time the butter is loaded into it when the chamber is open to the air, is much higher than the butter put into it coming from cold storage warehouses. But when the chamber is filled and closed, the mechanical cold storage brings the temperature down at once, and in almost all cases the record shows that where butter was stored the temperature was an even 30 to 34 degrees for the whole voyage until opened to the warmer air on landing in England.

Were Mr. Smith familiar with the handling of butter, he would know that, while it is well that butter intended to be kept for months should be in a chamber as low as 20 degrees—that for carriage to England, to be put before the consumer in a few days after arrival in England, 30 to 35 is quite cold enough for the proper and safe carriage of our butter.

To take up some details of Mr. Smith's criticism, as specimen of his inaccuracy and mis-statement: On pages 8,168, 6,970-1 of "Hansard" of last session are, amongst others, these statements:

"On the 'Monteagle,' which sailed May 29th, 1903, butter went in at a temperature of 40 degrees and never reached a point lower than 34 degrees."

Quite true; on the face of the record was the statement that cheese was carried in the same compartment, and that the engineer was instructed to keep this chamber at a temperature higher than 35 degrees.

Again, after quoting several records which were quite good, Mr. Smith says:

"On the 'Hibernian,' butter went in at a temperature nearly 70 degrees, but the refrigerator chambers were never able to get down the temperature lower than 42 degrees," etc., and winds up by, "I would not be surprised if all the butter in that steamer was entirely lost."

Perhaps Mr. Smith will be more surprised when he is reminded that on the face of this record—what he must have seen—it was apples and not butter in that chamber.

Again, Mr. Smith: "On the 'Iona,' the 5th of September from Montreal, the butter went in at a temperature of 66 degrees but never got to a point at any



'time during the journey lower than 44 degrees ; in other words it took the whole 'of the journey across the ocean in cold storage chambers to bring the temperature "down to 44 degrees, whereas a good cold storage chamber would bring down the "temperature in 48 hours, or at most 72 hours."

If what Mr. Smith demanded had been done, the fruit—not butter—which was stored in this chamber would have been ruined.

He quotes again : "The 'Pretorian,' sailing 15th August ; the 'Canada,' sailing "the 22nd August ; the 'Pretorian,' on the 19th September ; the 'Laconia,' the 3rd "September ; (where he remarks, 'That butter must have been almost ruined ; it "might as well have gone across in ordinary storage, thus saving ten shillings a "ton') ; and the 'Marina.'"

In all of which cases he quotes temperatures of chambers loaded with fruit, and complains that they were too hot for butter. There was another record of a butter chamber in each of these ships in which the temperature never went above 34 degrees, and in which the butter was perfectly safely carried and successfully delivered in good condition in the English market.

Summing up, he asks, "Who is to blame ? The Government are entirely to blame." For what ? For Mr. Smith's mis-statements ? For arrangements to carry fruit at a temperature at which it would not be frozen ; or for arranging to carry butter in a temperature in which it would not be heated ? The Government is not to blame for certain shipments of fruit sent by Mr. E. D. Smith himself in the same compartment with other fruit, which arrived in perfect condition and was sold at the highest market price, while Mr. Smith's shipments were pronounced wasty, and sold at a loss.

### Cooled Air Also.

Mr. John Torrance, of the Dominion Line, received from one of the largest apple exporters a letter, of which the following is an extract :

"In all cases when you have any goods going forward, unless you have direct "orders to do otherwise, put them in cool air or cold storage in preference to "ordinary stowage. I believe it pays every trip to do this."

Mr. John Torrance, on August 20th last, wrote Mr. Ruddick, Chief of the Dairy Division, a letter quite as emphatic :

"On the S.S. 'Kensington,' from Montreal on 25th July, we carried about 500 "boxes cheese, from two shippers, in cool-air chambers, and we wrote to our repre- "sentatives, asking them to report to us the condition of the cheese on arrival. "The following is an extract from a letter received to-day, dated Liverpool, "Aug. 12th :

“We attended discharge of cheese stowed in cool-air chamber of this vessel, and we are pleased to report that it landed in excellent condition. As suggested by you, we got several of the principal importers to examine the shipment, and they all expressed themselves very pleased with the condition, and promised to write out to their shippers recommending the cool-air stowage.”

It may be remarked here that there is no finality to improvement, and that as conditions are found to require changes the Government are ready and eager to experiment and bring about such improvements as are found necessary and efficient. The original cold storage arrangements serve their purpose; the later improved ventilation and cooled air serve their purpose equally well. When other difficulties are discovered the Department will tackle them and overcome them also.

### **The Experimental Farm.**

On the Central Experimental Farm the appointment of the Agriculturist, Mr. J. H. Grisdale, was followed by the setting apart of 200 acres to be worked as a dairy farm. In 1899, the first year of this work, 36 cattle were kept, it being a good year for all crops; last year 96 cattle were fed, although the season was generally an unfavorable one.

This result is due to systematic rotation and thorough cultivation, and is an evidence of what improvement has been made.

A large number of thoroughbred stock have been purchased and placed on the farm, and to-day visiting farmers can find typical specimens of the highest class of dairy Shorthorns, Guernseys, Ayrshires and French Canadian Cattle; as well as Leicester and Shropshire sheep, and Yorkshire, Berkshire and Tamworth bacon hogs. The old work horses have been replaced by first-class show teams, and the fields are a model of good tillage, clean culture and heavy crops.

A specimen of opposition criticism was the complaint of Sam Hughes, M.P., on the floor of the House, that there was a wheat field on the farm which was foul with oats and barley and rye. The Honourable Member knew so little of farming that he was not able to recognize a field of mixed grain, purposely sown for experiment as to the product of various mixtures.

### **THE LIVE STOCK DIVISION.**

The work of Mr. F. W. Hodson, as Live Stock Commissioner, has developed in the last four years to such an extent that this year an item of \$34,000 is devoted to it.

This is an entirely new branch of the Department.

The importance of the live stock interests is illustrated by the following census valuation of the live stock in Canada for the year 1900.

Milch cows.....	\$ 69,237,970
Other horned cattle.....	54,197,341
Horses.....	118,279,419
Sheep.....	10,490,594
Swine.....	16,445,702
<hr/>	
Making, exclusive of poultry.....	\$268,651,026
Animal products, except eggs.....	144,066,921
<hr/>	
Total animals and products.....	\$412,717,947

There was no Dominion organization of this work before. We now have an organized live stock association for the Dominion, and local associations in all the provinces. The live stock men of the different sections are brought into close touch. And—by means of auction sales organized under this Department, by means of the expansion and elaboration of the Guelph Fat Stock Show, the establishment of the Maritime Provinces Fat Stock Show at Amherst, the establishment of the Eastern Ontario and Quebec Live Stock Show at Ottawa, the establishment of a show at Calgary, and several minor gatherings—there has been developed a complete system of inter-provincial live stock trade.

There has been inaugurated and perfected a system of educational and illustrative work at the different fat stock and other exhibitions.

There has been an immense increase in the Farmers' Institute work, the Dominion Department supplying trained and expert lecturers to all the provinces. The local agricultural fairs have been supplied with expert judges, who not only have awarded the prizes but explained the differences between the competing animals and delivered lectures on the types which ought to be produced.

The stimulus to inter-provincial trade in live stock was very necessary. Before this work of the Department began, our Eastern breeders were sending their stockers to the United States to be finished, and the best of the profit from them was reaped in the foreign country.

### **Cattle Trade with Britain and the United States.**

In 1896 the average price of Canadian cattle sent to the United States was \$5.39; in 1900 it was \$16, but in 1903 it was \$28. The numbers increased from 1,645 in 1896, to 86,989 in 1900, but decreased to 10,432 in 1903. This decrease was due to the demand on the part of Canadian feeders for stockers, and to-day these animals are finished largely on our own ranges and shipped in the best condition to England.

The result is that our export trade to Great Britain has increased from

\$6,816,361 in 1896 to \$7,579,080 in 1900, the year the Live Stock Commissioner was appointed, and to \$10,842,438 in 1903. This satisfactory showing is largely due to the organization of the live stock interests aided by the Department and to the distribution of valuable information to those engaged in the business.

### The Veterinary Branch.

Closely allied to this care of the live stock interests is the work of the Veterinary Branch of the Department. Under the old regime this branch was in charge of an officer who had private business and gave only a portion of his time to the people's service. He did not even reside at Ottawa, but came there when called for by the Minister or when an emergency arose.

The Hon. Mr. Fisher appreciated that the work of caring for the health of Canadian live stock and of guarding against the introduction of disease from abroad, through the animal quarantine service, deserved the full time and attention of the most skilful talent available. Dr. McEachran, the former chief veterinary officer, was not willing to give his whole time to this work; the services of Dr. J. G. Rutherford were secured, and he was appointed to take charge of this branch.

With this change a more complete and thorough supervision of the health of live stock in Canada has been inaugurated. A thoroughly equipped bacteriological laboratory has been established, and a trained bacteriologist added to the staff, devoted entirely to the work of this branch. A considerable staff of permanent Government officers has been appointed, who perform the work formerly entrusted to local veterinaries, who were engaged from time to time as emergency arose. The result has been a much more effective and closer supervision of contagious disease, and a more careful and thorough investigation into the health of our flocks and herds.

Canadian live stock has been noted for its health and freedom from epidemics, but as the industry is increasing and the trade expanding, care and attention are more and more required. It may safely be said that, to-day, a most thorough and complete organization for this purpose is established.

### THE FRUIT MARKS ACT.

In 1901, the Fruit Marks Act was introduced and made law.

For some years there had been complaint of the bad packing and marking of Canadian fruit exported, especially apples; the result had been very general losses to the Canadian fruit grower and handler, and a very bad reputation for Canadian fruit in the English market.

This Act requires the marking of all closed packages with the name of the packer and the grade of the fruit, and also requires that the whole package should be uniform in quality.

The Act has now been in force for three years, each year more stringently. The result has been a marked improvement in the reputation of Canadian fruit in the Old Country.

It also applies to the local markets, and has been of great value to the home consumer.

So favorably has the Act been commented upon, that Mr. Boyle, the American Consul at Liverpool, England, on October 6th, 1903, reported to the Department of Commerce, at Washington :

"On the whole, the condition and quality of the fruit from the United States is satisfactory, but there were instances where the packing was very bad—in fact, some in the trade describe it as dishonest packing, a few large apples being put on the top and at the bottom of each barrel, and in the centre of the barrel all sorts of rubbishy apples were placed. If packers will be more particular in grading and packing, greater confidence will exist here with buyers, and the result will be better prices. *Great satisfaction is expressed at the result of the action taken by the Canadian Government to prevent fraudulent packing, for by it irresponsible shippers are prevented from operating.*"

The following, which appeared in "The Fruit Grower" of February 11th, published in London, England, confirms the opinion of Mr. Boyle :

"The United States Consul, in Edinburgh, records the fact that Canadian apple imports are gaining a very strong position in the Scotch markets,—in some cases vice the United States supplies. Mr. Fleming states that the system of inspection adopted in Canada, and as subsequently renewed at the British ports, has served as a guarantee to the buyers of Canadian fruit, and has in this way proved useful both to seller and purchaser."

A bill was introduced in the Senate of the State of New York, on February 10th last, at the suggestion of the Buffalo Produce Exchange, entitled "An Act to Amend the Domestic Commerce Law Relative to the Branding and Sale of Closed Packages of Fruit." The "Fruitman's Guide," discussing the bill, finds some fault with its wording, and goes on to say, "Canada's law is a success because it is a national law."

In the "Montreal Gazette's" report of the "Export Trade from the Port of Montreal, Season 1902," the following statement appears :

"A special feature in the trade this year was the improvement in the packing and the marking of the packages. Over-facing was practically absent, although in the matter of grading there is something yet to be desired. For the first time in the history of the apple trade the Canadian XXX. or No. 1 brand has been fairly uniform, and sales in the orchards of this brand will undoubtedly be a feature of the trade in the future.

*"The Fruit Marks Act is certainly responsible for the improvement in the facing, as well as in the grading."*

As last year the Canadian export of apples reached the figure of 1,598,614 barrels, valued at \$4 590.793, the importance of such an Act, and its influence on the trade can be understood.

### THE SEED GRAIN BRANCH.

For the last two sessions of Parliament the Hon. Mr Fisher has discussed the enactment of a law to control the trade in agricultural seeds; and has introduced a bill for that purpose, but the obstructive and factious opposition of the Conservative members has prevented its becoming law.

Careful investigation, under the supervision of Mr Clarke, Chief of the Seed Division of the Department, showed that there was a very considerable amount of foul and imperfect seed palmed off on our farmers, while there was no possibility of the individual purchaser knowing what he was getting.

This seemed a legitimate ground for legislative interference. The difficulties of working out a law which would fairly protect the farmer and not unduly interfere with legitimate trade were great; but, instead of aid and assistance being given, every obstacle and objection that could be possibly dreamed of was brought forward, and the Minister was not able to pass the law without resorting to a brute-force majority vote.

The investigation and the discussions which have been raised by the officers of the Department in agricultural meetings of all kinds have, however, served the purpose of stimulating observation and inquiry, and of improving the existing business.

It is still the determination of the Minister to persevere until a law adequate to the protection of the farmers shall be passed.

In this connection a notable work has been undertaken to form Seed Growers' Associations, through which it is hoped that improved seeds may be grown and distributed amongst the farmers of the country. Experimental work has shown that a decided increase in production can be brought about by improvement in the selection of seed, and this great help to the agriculture of the country is now well under way.

### THE POULTRY INDUSTRY.

The demand for information about, and the interest excited in the raising of poultry, has led to the appointment of Mr Victor Fortier, as Assistant to the Poultry Manager of the Experimental Farm, and consequently to an increased number of lectures given out from the Experimental Farm on this subject.

The Fattening Stations, under the Poultry Division of the Commissioner's Branch have been increased in numbers, and the whole has been carried a stage further, in that now three of the older stations have been equipped for breeding as well as raising and fattening the chicks.

In this breeding work a utility type of a table fowl has been carefully selected, and it has been proved that the chicks thus bred and raised at the station have fattened more profitably than those either raised from purchased eggs, or purchased at three months' old for fattening.

So popular has this breeding of the utility type of bird proved that the managers have been forced to sell most of their chicks to Canadian farmers for the improvement of their birds, instead of fattening them for the market.

Another remarkable development is that the home market absorbs practically all the fattened poultry. The dwellers in our Canadian cities, having tasted the properly fattened poultry supplied from the Government fattening stations, have demanded more and more, until now the Government stations, and very many private individuals who have learned how to do this work from the illustrations at the Government stations, are not able to fill the local demand. Such fattened poultry now commands in the large Canadian cities as high as 12, 13 and 14 cents a pound, while formerly the Canadian farmer was obliged to be content with 5, 6 or 7 cents a pound for his barnyard birds.

#### CONSERVATIVE TESTIMONY.

As an instance of the influence which the Government illustration stations have on private enterprise, Mr. A. A. Wright, M.P. for Renfrew, in the House of Commons during last session, read an extract from the Renfrew "Mercury," adding that it was written by Mr. Muirhead, a leading Conservative, and President of the Farmers' Institute in Renfrew :

"An Admaston farmer resolved to make a test—to see if in farm practice there was really any profit in fattening chickens on the plan followed at the Government's experimental station here a short time ago. So he took 30 ordinary chickens—not at all large ones—and fed them on oats and barley, mixed with low grade flour, for five weeks, and then sent 24 of them off to a Montreal commission merchant whose name was one of several which had been furnished him by Mr. F. C. Hare, the Government's demonstrator. He received answer that the 24 fowl had weighed 158 pounds, and remittance was made for them at the rate of 11 (eleven) cents a pound in Montreal. The expressage cost the Admaston farmer 80 cents per 100 pounds, so that he received \$10.20 per 100 pounds net for his fowl. The fowl were kept confined in coops, were fed twice a day, and in the five weeks the thirty ate 8 bushels of oats, 2 bushels of barley, and 100 pounds of low-grade (unsaleable) flour, with just enough skim-milk added to make the food moist. Water to drink and gravel to peck were supplied. The farmer was so well pleased with the result of his experiment, that he will fatten more chickens next year. He knows nothing that pays better for the amount of labor involved. The merchant to whom he sold rather took his breath away by writing that if he could supply broilers weighing 1½ or 2 pounds in April or May, he would get 45 cents a pound for them."



Further on in his speech, Mr. Wright made another quotation of a letter which was written from Riverside, California, in March of this year, and published in the Renfrew "Mercury":

"In an agricultural way you have gained enormously over this country. Speaking recently with one of the ablest men who are taking care of our agricultural and horticultural interests at Washington, I was really pleased to have him say that the Department of Agriculture in Canada was far in advance of that in this country."

### Tobacco Growing.

The customs and excise duties of the present Government on tobacco have given encouragement to the use of home-grown tobacco in Canada. By the arrangement of the duties there is a certain protection of the Canadian grower of tobacco, and by the arrangement of the licenses there is encouragement to the manufacturer to use Canadian tobacco. The result has been most stimulating, but the Canadian producer was not thoroughly up in the best methods of handling this peculiar crop.

The Minister of Agriculture undertook certain work at the Experimental Farm, and put up there a scientifically constructed tobacco drying house. In the Province of Quebec experiments were conducted, under the supervision of the Department, in the growth of different varieties, and a small Experimental Station was established at St. Jacques de l'Achigan. Owing to the resignation of the manager, this work was suspended. The Minister, however, sent an expert tobacco grower and handler to Belgium, to find out just what methods were most successful in preparing the tobacco for the market, and a valuable report was obtained. Further investigations have been carried on in the United States as to the methods of curing and handling the crop there, and to-day a mass of information is collected and prepared for distribution to the tobacco growers of the country, which it is confidently expected will revolutionize the methods and increase the profits from this most important crop.

The great importance of it may be seen from the census reports, which show that in 1890, there were only 314,086 pounds of tobacco grown in Ontario, and 3,958,737 in Quebec: in 1900, the yield had risen to 3,503,739 pounds for Ontario, and 7,655,917 pounds for Quebec.

The reports of the Department of Inland Revenue show that in 1895-96, the number of factories of foreign leaf was 27, while only 10 were engaged in the manufacture of domestic leaf. At the end of last year, the number of factories engaged in foreign leaf had fallen from 27 to 23, while the number engaged in domestic and mixed tobacco had increased from 10 to 30. In 1895-96, under the Conservative regime, we manufactured 9,609,184 pounds of foreign leaf tobacco, nearly the whole consumption being of foreign leaf tobacco.

We only manufactured and consumed in that year 474,205 pounds of Canadian tobacco. The Liberal policy has been so fruitful in good results that last year we manufactured 7,726,316 pounds, and into that manufacture there entered 4,921,181 pounds of Canadian leaf. During 1902, 3,712,150 cigars made with Canadian tobacco went into consumption, as against only 704,910 in 1898. So thanks to the progressive policy of the Liberal Government, the Canadian leaf is rapidly displacing foreign leaf in Canada.

When the Laurier Government took office the work of the Department of Agriculture, for farmers, consisted of the Experimental Farm system and the work of Professor Robertson as Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying. Professor Robertson had no expert officer to assist him. At the present time his Branch comprises: The Live Stock Division, under Mr. Hodson; the Dairying Division proper, under Mr. Ruddick; the Fruit Division, under Mr. McNeill; the Seed Division, under Mr. Clark; the Extension of Markets Division, under Mr. Moore; and the Poultry Division.

### Agricultural Export Trade 1890-1903.

The Agricultural Exports, the produce of Canada, for seven years under Conservative rule, 1890-1896, compared with exports for seven years under the Liberals, 1896-1903.

YEAR	Animals and Products	Agricultural Products.
1890.....	25,106,995	11,908,030
1891.....	25,967,741	13,666,858
1892.....	28,594,850	22,113,284
1893.....	31,736,499	22,049,490
1894.....	31,881,973	17,677,649
1895.....	34,387,770	15,719,128
1896.....	36,507,641	14,083,361
Total, 1890-1896.....	214,183,469	117,217,800
1897.....	39,245,252	17,982,646
1898.....	44,301,470	33,063,285
1899.....	46,743,130	22,952,915
1900.....	56,148,807	27,516,609
1901.....	55,495,311	24,781,486
1902.....	59,161,209	37,152,688
1903.....	69,817,542	44,624,321
Total, 1897-1903.....	370,912,721	208,073,950
Total, 1890-1896.....	214,183,469	117,217,800
Increase for 1897-1903.....	156,729,252	90,856,150

## Prices Compared.

The following table will illustrate the course of our export trade in the leading Agricultural products and show the differences in the prices received by our farmers for these products during the former Administration and at present :

PRODUCTS.	18 8.			1903.		
	QUANTITY.	PRICE.	VALUE.	QUANTITY.	PRICE.	VALUE.
Cattle to Eng-land .....	97,042	\$70. 24	\$ 6,816,361	161,170	\$87. 27	\$ 10,842,438
Cattle to U.S. ....	1,646	5. 39	8,870	10,432	28. 01	292,288
Eggs .....	6,250,678	0. 123	807,086	7,404,100	0. 193	1,436,130
Butter .....	5,889,241	0. 178	1,052,089	34,128,944	0. 203	6,954,618
Cheese.....	164,689,123	0. 084	13,956,571	229,099,925	0. 108	24,712,943
Bacon, Ham and Pork...	55,079,032	0. 08	4,446,884	143,288,402	0. 111	16,029,269
Beef .....	411,468	0. 051	21,158	2,378,175	0. 086	206,563
Mutton.....	150,013	0. 05	7,458	84,212	0. 092	7,794
Wheat.....	9,919,542	0. 58	5,771,521	32,985,745	0. 744	24,566,703
Wheat Flour.....	186,716	3. 85	718,433	1,287,766	3. 65	4,699,143
Oats.....	968,137	0. 28	273,861	7,593,177	0. 34	2,583,151
Pease .....	1,757,115	0. 73	1,299,491	1,144,754	0. 919	1,052,743
Rye .....	29	0. 62	18	470,419	0. 573	269,952
Corn .....	9,765	0. 36	3,548	70,328	0. 516	36,325
Buckwheat.....	405,000	0. 42	173,689	314,349	0. 557	175,394
Potatoes.....	596,635	0. 38	227,606	660,967	0. 585	386,748
Hay .....	214,640	9. 21	1,976,431	450,053	7. 98	3,595,665
Poultry.....			18,992			160,518
Apples, green or ripe.....	567,182	2. 50	1,416,470	1,000,528	2. 75	2,758,724
Horses .....	21,852	96. 70	2,113,095	3,878	153. 66	595,921
Sheep .....	391,490	5. 50	2,151,283	401,443	4. 12	1,655,681
			\$43,250,915			\$103,018,711
						43,250,915
Increased receipts upon these articles in 1903.....						\$59,757,796

### Seven-Year Periods Contrasted.

The following is a comparison of the last seven years under Conservative rule with the past seven years under Liberal administration with respect to our domestic exports of Eggs, Butter, Cheese, Bacon, Ham and Pork :

YEAR.	EGGS.	BUTTER.	CHEESE.	BACON, HAMS AND PORK.
1890.....	\$1,795,214	\$ 340,131	\$ 9,372,212	\$ 645,360
1891.....	1,160,359	602,175	9,508,800	632,558
1892.....	1,089,798	1,056,058	11,652,412	1,158,872
1893.....	868,007	1,296,814	13,407,470	2,052,471
1894.....	714,054	1,095,588	15,488,191	2,976,483
1895.....	807,990	697,476	14,253,002	3,839,145
1896.....	807,086	1,052,089	13,956,571	4,446,884
1890-1896.....	\$7,242,508	\$ 6,140,331	\$87,638,658	\$15,752,773
1897.....	\$ 978,479	\$ 2,089,173	\$14,676,239	\$ 5,871,988
1898.....	1,255,304	2,046,686	17,572,763	8,092,930
1899.....	1,267,063	3,700,873	16,776,765	10,473,211
1900.....	1,457,902	5,122,156	19,856,324	12,803,034
1901.....	1,691,640	3,295,663	20,696,951	11,829,820
1902.....	1,733,242	5,660,541	19,686,291	12,457,863
1903.....	1,436,130	6,954,618	24,712,943	16,029,269
	\$9,819,760	\$28,869,710	\$133,978,276	\$77,558,115
1897-1903—Total .....	\$9,819,760	\$28,869,710	\$133,978,276	\$77,558,115
1890-1896— " .....	7,242,508	6,140,331	87,638,658	15,752,773
Increase for 1897-1903 .....	\$2,577,252	\$22,729,379	\$ 46,339,618	\$61,805,342

The increased receipts to the Canadian farmers for these four products alone amount to the enormous sum of \$133,451,591.

During the 7 years of Liberal rule ending in June last, 1903,  
the total agricultural exports amounted to.....\$ 578,986,671  
During the last 7 years of the Conservative regime the total  
agricultural exports were of the value of..... 331,401,278

Making an increase for the last 7 years of.....\$ 247,585,393

or 70%. Or, more simply expressed, it means \$5.25 more in the pocket of every owner of a Canadian farm not less than five acres in area, there being in all Canada 471,833 of such owners.

This increase in the exports of agricultural products is equal to 53% of the total increase in Canadian exports of all kinds during the last 7 years.

Of these exports, the four which are most directly benefitted by the mechanical cold storage and cold air accommodation provided by the present

Minister, viz.: butter, cheese, eggs and bacon, as shown in the table given above, amounted in the Liberal 7-year period to \$250,225,000, against \$116,774,000 under the Conservatives, or an increase of \$133,451,000 in favor of the Liberal period. This is considerably more than half of the total increase in the total exports of all our Canadian agricultural products, and is certainly a startling record.

The profitable sale, by the 471,000 Canadian farm owners, of this additional 133 millions worth of these four products, even excluding from consideration all others, marks the vast difference there is between depression and discouragement on the one hand, and prosperity and contentment on the other.

Of the four perishable products mentioned, there were exported during the last fiscal year, 1903, the amount of.....

Against, for 1896.....	\$49,132,960
.....	20,262,630
Increase .....	\$28,870,330

The great bulk of this \$49,132,960 worth of exports was directly benefitted by the mechanical cold storage and the cooled-air accommodation provided through the initiative of the Liberal Minister and now controlled by him through his staff of expert officials.

The Conservatives, who are fond of comparing our trade with that of the United States, will find little comfort in the following statement of the American exports of Butter and Cheese :

	CHEESE.	BUTTER.
1890.....	\$ 8,591,042	\$ 4,187,489
1891.....	7,405,376	2,197,106
1892.....	7,676,657	2,445,878
1893.....	7,624,648	1,672,690
1894.....	7,180,331	2,077,608
1895.....	5,497,539	915,533
1896.....	3,091,914	2,937,203
1890-1896.....	\$47,067,507	\$16,563,507
1897.....	\$ 4,636,063	\$ 4,493,364
1898.....	4,559,324	3,864,765
1899.....	3,316,049	3,263,951
1900.....	4,943,609	3,143,509
1901.....	3,950,999	4,014,905
1902.....	2,745,597	2,886,609
1903.....	2,250,229	1,604,327
1897-1903.....	\$26,401,870	\$23,270,430
1890-1896.....	47,067,507	16,563,507
Decrease for Cheese, 1897-1903....	\$20,665,637	
Increase for Butter, 1897-1903....		\$ 6,706,923

Thus we see that while the exports of cheese from the United States during the period 1897-1903 decreased \$20,665,637, our exports of cheese during the same period increased \$46,339,618; and while, with their large population, they only increased their exports of butter \$6,705,923, we increased ours \$22,729,379. Moreover, their cheese decreased from \$3,091,914, in 1896, to \$2,250,229, in 1903; and their butter decreased from \$2,937,203 in 1896 to \$1,604,327 in 1903.

This contrast shows how much more successful Canadian methods of production and conveyance, and Canadian fiscal policy have proved than those of the United States.

### **Comparison of Canada's Trade in Agricultural Products With the United States' Trade.**

Our Conservative friends have been advocating as a model worthy of imitation the United States tariff, which averages little short of 50 per cent. on all classes of dutiable imported goods. From their emphatic statements, one is led to believe that the door could be effectually closed to imports. Let us examine the facts.

For this purpose we will compare Canadian and United States exports and imports, beginning with the Canadian trade.

For the Canadian trade we will avoid the unfair proceeding of the Conservative members who, in Parliament, have been in the habit of selecting for this discussion only the few products that may particularly suit their purpose, hoping to score a point by withholding a part of the truth. We will take the list of agricultural exports, the produce of Canada, and of imports consumed in Canada, as given by the Dominion Statistician from year to year for several years back, and which appears for the year 1903 in the 1903 edition, at pages 146-148. We will consider the products that are there specifically named, including living animals, meats, provisions, fruits, grains, vegetables, and the special products therein mentioned, which make up a complete list. This list does not comprise such tropical fruits as bananas, pineapples, oranges, lemons, nor raisins, currants and prunes of foreign variety, which the dishonest Conservatives often include to serve as the basis of the present discussion, as if these tropical productions could be produced in this country. Wool unmanufactured, hemp and flax were placed by the Conservatives on the free list as manufacturers' raw material. We have kept them free, and they should not figure in this discussion. We will also remove from the discussion: Free corn, the live stock men's boon, and corn which is dutiable for distillation purposes, of which our Ontario farmers cannot produce a sufficient quantity to supply the distillers. We shall make a special reference to these products later, to fully justify their

omission from the present discussion. We will also remove such brands of tobacco, required for manufacturers' raw material, as we do not produce in Canada, and upon which the manufacturer must pay heavy customs and excise taxes upon removing it from the bonded warehouse. As the result we have the following complete table of our agricultural exports to the United States, the produce of Canada, and of our agricultural imports from the United States that were entered for consumption in Canada during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903:

## STATEMENT No. 1.

EXPORTS TO U. S.		IMPORTS FROM U. S.	
Cattle .....	\$ 292,288	.....	\$ 472,689
Horses .....	340,239	.....	790,169
Sheep .....	961,109	.....	206,856
Swine .....	313,790	.....	1,626
Poultry .....	38,571	.....	.....
Poultry and game, dressed and undressed .....	18,158	.....	58,975
Butter .....	10,225	.....	137,654
Cheese .....	7,779	.....	30,401
Eggs .....	6,436	.....	*121,262
Barley .....	17,148	.....	1,038
Beans .....	53,865	.....	25,590
Bran .....	91,048	Bran, mill, feed, etc .....	106,518
Oats .....	39,062	.....	50,896
Pease .....	210,033	.....	14,138
Wheat .....	536,264	.....	57,794
Wheat flour .....	68,216	.....	115,279
Hay .....	1,924,598	.....	126,646
Hops .....	.....	.....	93,716
Tallow .....	238	.....	3,142
Lard .....	130	.....	41,381
Bacon and Hams .....	1,223	Bacon, hams, shoulders and sides .....	410,200
Mutton .....	5,007	.....	1,652
Pork .....	8,631	Pork in brine .....	497,279
Beef .....	8,668	Beef, salted, in barrels .....	76,486
Meats, canned and all others ..	16,741	Smoked, dried, preserved, etc. ....	91,561
Canned meats, canned poultry and game .....	.....	.....	.....
Seeds—clover and grass .....	124,303	Seeds, all kinds .....	163,066
Potatoes .....	56,969	.....	443,099
Turnips .....	103,306	.....	228,640
Other vegetables .....	17,705	.....	.....
Vegetables, canned and preserved .....	1,258	.....	.....
Melons .....	.....	.....	16,318

\*This item is put down in the Year Book in error at \$559,236 inst \$121,262, making the total imports on page 148 \$436,652 too large.



## STATEMENT NO. I.—CONTINUED.

EXPORTS TO U. S.		IMPORTS FROM U. S.
Fresh tomatoes .....		\$ 69,014
Tomatoes, corn, beans, etc., in can.....		115,905
Tomatoes, fresh or dry-salted n. o. p.....		210,983
Straw .....	\$ 11,567	
Trees, shrubs and plants .....	6,279	47,715
Peaches.....		70,903
Cranberries.....		37,412
Cherries.....		14,754
Plums.....		49,611
Apples, dried, green or ripe.....	24,183	87,131
Berries.....	109,698	90,439
Totals.....	\$5,425,035	\$5,122,938
		5,425,035
Balance of trade in our favor .....		\$ 302,097

Referring to the preceding statement, the high tariff of the United States, although designed to be prohibitive, has not prevented Canadian farmers from exporting to the Yankees \$302 097 worth more than the Canadians imported from them. At the same time we exported to all countries \$114,000,000 worth of these same products.

We find that these imports from the United States went into the Western Provinces of Canada as follows:

Manitoba.....	\$ 453,450
North-West Territories.....	938,985
British Columbia.....	982,499
Yukon.....	734,778
Total Imports into Western Canada.....	\$3,109,712
	5,122,938
Leaving Imports to East .....	\$2,013,226

While agricultural products of the value of \$2 013 226, in 1903, came into Canada east of Lake Superior, into the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the Maritime Provinces—at the same time the great bulk of our agricultural exports to the United States, of the value of \$5 425,000, were the production of the very same provinces and passed through the Customs port of Eastern Canada to that country. A glance at the list we have just given will easily convince that this was the fact in the case of nearly all the articles enumerated

that are of considerable amount ; for instance the "Animals," "Hay," "Seeds," "Vegetables," "Fruits." The imports into Western Canada were distributed amongst the chief classes of products we have just mentioned as follows :

Animals.....	\$1,421,106
Grain—Yukon and British Columbia.....	112,768
Hay—Yukon and British Columbia.....	121,665
Meats .....	616,343
Butter, Cheese and Eggs—Yukon and British Columbia.....	281,563
Vegetables.....	196,093
Total Import of these special things.....	\$2,749,538

The farmers of Eastern Ontario find a more profitable market abroad for their similar products, and it would be impossible for them to send those products to the far West and North to take the place of these imports from the United States.

We find, however, certain of these imports are brought in as raw materials to be finished in Canada to the profit of our Canadian farmers. For instance, there has been for a few years a shortage of cattle in the ranges of the West. Sufficient stockers could not be supplied by Eastern Canada, and our ranchers therefore imported from Mexico and the United States, in the last year, \$472,689 worth. These were fed on our Canadian ranches and exported at a greatly enhanced price. As the Canadian supply increases and overtakes the demand this importation will not be necessary ; but had prohibitory duties shut these animals out, our ranches would have been seriously handicapped, and their profits in the business of finishing these animals would have been lost to the country.

In addition to the list of imports and exports which we have already given, our readers will derive valuable instruction from a study of the following table, comprising staple articles only of Canadian agricultural production and export. The table shows the quantity and value of our total imports from the United States of the articles mentioned, also our total production and total exports of the same things, as well as their distribution as between Eastern and Western Canada.

## STATEMENT NO. III.

	Imports from U. S.	Imports to Yukon, etc.	Imports to East Canada.	Total Exports.
Hay .....	\$ 126,646	\$ 121,667	\$ 4 979	\$ 3 596,557
(Quantity from U. S., 8,000 tons)				
(Total production, 8,000,000 tons)				
Live Animals.....	1,507,619	1,421,106	86,513	13,972,596
Barley.....	1,038			457,333
(Quantity from U. S., 2,609 bush.)				
(Total production, 34,000,000 bush.)				
Oats.....	70,657			2,632,886
(Quantity from U. S., 100,000 bush.)				
(Total production, 151,000,000 bush.)				
Pease.....	17,617			1,056,256
Wheat .....	57,794			29,088,781
(Quantity from U. S., 84,000 bush.)				
(Total production, 93,000,000 bush.)				
Beans .....	26,332			79,801
Total Grain .....	173,432	125,000	48,432	33,315,067
Potatoes.....	228,848			389,090
(Quantity from U. S., 407,000 bush.)				
(Total production, 55,000,000 bush.)				
Apples.....	79,890			2,759,047
(Quantity from U. S., 81,000 bush.)				
(Total production, 48,000,000 bush.)				
Butter.....	131,745	116,000	15,745	6,958,906
(Quantity from U. S., 658,000 lbs.)				
(Total production, 141,000,000 lbs.)				
Cheese.....	30,400	17,400	13,000	24,776,406
(Quantity from U. S., 269,000 lbs.)				
(Export to England, 229,000,000 lbs.)				
Eggs.....	121,563	120,000	1,000	1,441,254
(Quantity from U. S., 772,000 doz.)				
(Total production, 84,000,000 doz.)				
Total provisions, including meats.....	1,744,896	750 000	1,250,000	50,569,442

## Study the Tables.

The preceding table shows that we exported enormously more than we imported, and that the small quantity we did import, entering far from our great producing centres, did not come into competition with the produce of our farmers.

Perhaps the reader does not realize exactly the extraordinary disproportion there is between the imports and the production by our farmers of these things which are the staple products of the farm. By studying the table he will see that for hay there is *one ton* imported to *one thousand* grown in Canada. For barley, there is *one bushel* imported to *thirty-four thousand* produced. For

oats, there is *one bushel to one thousand five hundred*. For wheat, there is *one bushel imported to one thousand produced*. For potatoes, *one bushel to one hundred and thirty*. For live stock, there is *one dollar's worth imported to two hundred and twenty eight dollars' worth already in Canada*; *one dollar's worth of meat to seventy dollars' worth in animals killed and sold in Canada, the produce of Canada, during the year 1903*.

There is *one horse imported during the year to one hundred and fifty already in Canada*.

For apples, there is *one bushel imported to six hundred produced*. For butter, *one pound imported to two hundred produced*. For cheese, *one pound imported to two thousand exported to England*. For eggs, *one dozen imported to one hundred produced*.

Therefore, what words can be severe enough to properly stigmatize the action of the Conservatives, who are trying to play upon the credulity and the presumed ignorance of the stalwart yeomanry of this country; the Tory politicians who are promising, with an emphasis which is peculiarly their own, that they will do for them, by means of high protection, what they during the eighteen years of their regime, failed to do, and what they well know they cannot do, viz: to absolutely stop the importation of a limited quantity of products from the United States; who are promising the farmers what they now possess, prosperity, as the result of an additional "home market," when they know this additional "home market" is of insignificant volume; being on an average anywhere from one dollar's worth of products imported to from one hundred to one thousand dollars' worth produced.

### The Tory Model.

The United States is held up to us as our model. Let us examine their total exports and imports and their agricultural exports:

	1901	1902	1903
Imports.....	\$ 822,756,000	\$ 903,320,000	\$1,025,619,000
Exports. ....	1,487,656,000	1,381,719,000	1,419,991,000

This statement, taken from the official returns of the United States Government, shows that even with the enormous protection of 50 per cent. the imports have steadily increased, while the exports have somewhat fallen off.

But in order to better observe how this falling off in exports affects the farmer, let us examine the exports from the United States of agricultural produce, including, according to their grouping, animals, breadstuffs and provisions added together:

	1901	1902	1903
Agricultural Exports.....	\$525,613,125	\$457,867,406	\$435,863,192

Contrast with this our own trade for the same period under a moderate revenue tariff and we find our total imports and exports for each of the same years increasing in a healthy relative proportion as follows:

	1901	1902	1903
Imports.....	\$181,237,988	\$202,791,595	\$233,790,516
Exports.....	177,431,386	196,019,763	214,401,674
Agricultural exports.	80,276,797	96,313,897	114,441,862

## Protection for the Market Gardener.

The Hon J. I. Tarte, while Minister of Public Works in the Liberal Ministry, was recognized as a constant adherent to the protective principle. His uncompromising attitude on the question, repeatedly expressed in public, led to the open rupture with the Prime Minister, and to his withdrawal from the Cabinet and from the party.

### NOW IN THE TORY RANKS

During the session of 1902, Mr. Leonard, M.P. for Laval, introduced in Parliament a motion in favor of considerably raising the duties on vegetables. He was supported in the debate by the member for Jacques-Cartier, Mr. Monk. At that time the same arguments were used which have since been repeated with great emphasis by Mr. Blain, the Conservative member for Peel, Ontario.

Mr. Tarte, who—immediately after severing his connection with the Liberal Government—was recognized by the Conservatives, and was especially paraded before the public by the "Montreal Daily Star," as the high priest of protection on April 28th, 1902 spoke in the House of Commons, in opposition to Mr. Leonard's motion, as follows:

"My hon. friend wants us to raise the duties upon lettuce, cucumbers, tomatoes, asparagus, celery, beets, onions, etc. It is well known that in the winter months we do not grow cabbages nor cucumbers. We are also aware that it is extremely difficult to raise tomatoes in the winter season. We had to pay, last winter, fifty cents a pound for tomatoes of Canadian growth, whilst American tomatoes were being sold on the Montreal market at twenty cents a pound.

"It is idle to appeal to prejudices. There are enough people buying tomatoes and lettuce, for let it be known that I am speaking the plain, unvarnished truth. Cauliflowers are not grown in the winter months in Canada. I agree that during a certain season of the year they can be kept, perhaps during two or three months. The cauliflowers we buy in the winter are imported from the United States.

"In short, I believe that what the hon. gentleman is aiming at is to make "political capital with the electors and to catch popular favor rather than appealing to their reason. Let my hon. friend allow me, in all due deference, to call his attention to the fact that in the Province of Quebec, as elsewhere, farmers have a great deal of common sense. Go through the county of Laval and ask the market-gardeners if they can produce cucumbers, celery, tomatoes, and cauliflowers in the winter months, and they will tell you that they cannot do so."

Further on, answering the hon. member for Laval, the Minister of Public Works of that day used the following language:

"My hon. friend knows very well that, even if additional duties were imposed on pease, tomatoes, cucumbers, and other vegetables, that would neither improve the climate nor enable us to grow those vegetables to advantage during the winter months. The increase in the duties asked for by my hon. friend would only result in forcing the consumer to pay more for those products, without improving the condition of the Canadian producer. To my mind, such a proposition is preposterous."

Mr. Tarte so spoke with evident sincerity, and with a practical knowledge of the facts and circumstances connected with this industry, and in spite of his outspoken predilection for higher protection on the general list of importations. And in that attitude he was quite consistent. The protection on these products, that had existed for eighteen years, was in 1897, and is still maintained. The total imports of vegetables for 1903, including potatoes, were \$703 389, which paid duties to the amount of \$190 690, or 27 per cent. The question of the further increase of this protection, in favor of about 10 000 gardeners in the vicinity chiefly of Toronto and Montreal, against a consuming population of 700,000, is, we think, a fair question for the proposed Fielding Tariff Commission to decide after hearing all parties interested.

### Indian Corn.

Take another item—Indian corn. But little of this can be raised in Canada. In the greater part of the Dominion stock owners find it more profitable to turn their Indian corn into ensilage than to attempt the uncertain task of ripening it for grain. The crops of Indian corn for ensilage supply our farmers with a greatly increased quantity of roughage for their stock, and therefore enable them to keep more stock than they used to. For the profitable finishing of this stock, however, they require concentrated feed, and the corn now imported free from the United States enables them to economically fatten their stock. The import of Indian corn is a great advantage to the farmers of Canada, and has assisted especially the live stock industry, which is the basis and mainstay of the agricultural prosperity of the Dominion.

During several years of Conservative rule, if a Canadian whiskey distiller wanted to import American corn to make Canadian whiskey and export it to the United States for the Yankees to drink, he got 99 per cent. rebate on the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  cents a bushel of duty paid on the corn. But if a Canadian cattle grower, a Canadian farmer, wanted to import American corn to fatten Canadian cattle or swine to ship to the British markets, he had to pay the duty and he got no rebate. The Liberal Government, in 1897, reversed this policy, made the distillers continue to pay the duty, but made corn free to the farmers.

The following year our corn growers got a higher price for their corn, and got better prices for their coarse grains as well, notwithstanding Tory predictions to the contrary. The Ontario farmers who had 317 667 acres in corn, in 1896, before corn was made free, had, in 1902, increased their acreage to 371,959 and the export rose from \$3,548, at 36 cents per bushel, in 1896, to \$118,563 at 58 cents per bushel in 1902.

### Tory Tariff Tinkering.

In the folding leaflet which the Conservatives are circulating, they remind the electors of their attitude in the House of Commons in 1903, when they supported and the Liberals opposed "adequate protection" to the market gardeners and the farmers. They give a list of the rates of duties in Canada and in the United States on each article, showing them to be all the way from 100 to 150 per cent. to the advantage of the American.

We have just exploded the fallacy of the pretension that our farmers have been at all injured by this apparent tariff advantage.

The Conservatives include in their list, butter, cheese, potatoes, apples, wheat, oats, barley, pease, hay and eggs.

Eggs had been left on the free list during sixteen years of the Conservative regime until 1894, when they put on a five cent duty. The Liberals reduced it to three cents.

The Conservatives at first left the duty on potatoes as it was in 1878 at ten cents. We have maintained it at the rate they raised it to, viz., fifteen cents.

We have maintained the full duty on everything else enumerated, except wheat and wheat flour, which they do not include in their list. For the first twelve years of their regime, *when the struggling farmers needed it most*, they left the duty on flour at fifty cents a barrel. In our era of expanding wheat production and flour milling we have reduced the duty from seventy-five to sixty cents a barrel on flour, and from fifteen to twelve cents per bushel on wheat. Of our action in doing this we have received no complaint, and we imagine that our farmers



have too much common sense to complain when there is an import of but *one bushel of wheat to every thousand bushels they produce*

In their list the Conservatives say nothing about living animals. In 1890, shortly before the 1891 elections, they raised the duty on cattle from twenty per cent. to thirty per cent.; but at the next revision of the tariff, in 1894, *regretted the concession to the then struggling farmers and put the duty back to twenty per cent. In our prosperous times twenty per cent was considered high enough, and has been maintained*

In 1890, previous to the elections, the duty on live hogs was raised from twenty per cent. to two cents per pound; and the duty on cured meats, including pork in brine, was raised from two to three cents per pound. The Conservatives regretted their pre-election action and at the next revision, in 1894 reduced the duty on live hogs to one and one-half cents, and on cured meats to two cents a pound; and yet in one of their campaign folders they take credit for raising the duty in 1890 without making the slightest allusion to their reducing it in 1894. Surely if there was ever a time when the struggling live stock men needed the higher duty it was at that very time. In our era of abounding prosperity among these particular interests we have maintained the 1894 rates.

### "The Farmer Robbed of His Market."

The Conservatives have been recently encumbering His Majesty's mail service with the free distribution, from Ottawa, of a great mass of literature in the shape of a newspaper sheet containing, under various glaring headings, short placards or proclamations containing glittering generalities unsupported by detailed proof.

An instance of such misleading statement is the following, under the heading:

#### "THE FARMER ROBBED OF HIS MARKET."

"The Canadian Farmer should feed Canada.

"But he does not.

"Large sums of Canadian money, that should go to the Canadian farmer, are each year spent with the farmers of the United States.

"In 1903 Canada bought from foreign farmers, for home consumption:

"\$5,456,136 of Breadstuffs.

"\$2 418,591 of Provisions and Vegetables.

"\$8,004,424 of Animals and their products.

"Total, \$15,879,151.

"This is because the Liberal Government's tariff favors THE UNITED STATES FARMER instead of the Canadian farmer."

From the context accompanying the figures the reader would naturally infer that the "foreign farmers" above mentioned, from whom the purchases were made, were exclusively American. That is not the fact; the figures given include imports from all countries. In an appeal to an intelligent class of people, why should they set out to show the import trade from the United States, as if no other country was concerned, and then immediately, without any explanation, proceed to mix the United States imports with the imports from all other countries? Surely their cause is a very bad one when such fraud is necessary to bolster it up.

Besides the fact that the figures contain the imports of all other countries as well as the American, they contain whole classes of products that are not and cannot be produced in Canada, as we will show later. Assuming that these figures comprise only things that really sell in our markets in competition with what our farmers produce, still we find that in 1903 we sent of these things to foreign markets :

\$40,857,204 of Breadstuffs.  
 \$51,134,131 of Provisions and Vegetables.  
 \$16,360,577 of Animals and their products.  
 Total, \$108,345,912.

In comparison with which the \$15,879,151 of importations form only 15 per cent ; 85 per cent. is a pretty large balance of trade in our favor.

The following items which are included should not be :

Rice, tapioca, sago, arrowroot, vermicelli and fancy biscuits of same, etc., etc .....	\$1,124,471
Free corn, the live stock man's raw material.....	3,250,329
Animals for improvement of stock.....	805,029
Hides, the leather manufacturer's and the shoemaker's raw material .....	5,662,525

Total of imports which should come out.....	\$10,842,354
---	--------------

We shall make no mention of sweet potatoes, canned sweet corn, and many other things we cannot produce which are also included. Taking from the \$15,879,151, the total of the imports as given by the Conservatives, this amount of \$10,842,354, we have then reduced to \$5,036 797, as follows :

Breadstuffs .....	\$1,081,334
Provisions and Vegetables .....	2,418,591
Animals (their produce, apart from hides, being included in Provisions) .....	1,536,651
	<hr/>
	\$5,036,576

Mr. E. D. Smith, the Conservative member for Wentworth, Ontario, speaking on this subject in the House of Commons, on the 9th June, 1904, made a careful selection of the agricultural imports into Canada from all countries, which he considered came into competition with what our farmers produce. That list, of course, contains things such as hay, hops, trees and plants, etc., which do not come under the general classification adopted in this case by the Conservatives. Mr. Smith made his comprehensive list amount to \$5,756,228.

Under the Conservative headings: Breadstuffs, Provisions, Vegetables and Animals, the only agricultural imports therefore concerning which there can be any question of competition with Canadian farmers, amount, as we have shown, to \$5,036,576.

The great bulk of these things have gone to the Yukon, British Columbia, the North-West Territories and Manitoba. The following table, besides showing their distribution as between Eastern and Western Canada, gives also our total exports of the same products:

	IMPORTS.		EXPORTS.
	West.	East.	
Breadstuffs .....	\$ 272,288	\$ 809,046	\$40,857,204
Provisions and Vegetables	882,724	1,535,867	51,134,131
Animals.....	1,421,106	150,058	16,360,577
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$2,576,118	\$2,494,971	\$108,345,912

It has not been seriously urged by the people in Western Canada that the agricultural imports there have had the slightest effect in displacing the Canadian product. These imports were either stockers imported at an average price in 1903 of \$12 50 per head, to serve as the raw material of our graziers, or they were imports into British Columbia, and the Yukon especially—places far removed from our centres of agricultural production and comparatively much nearer and of easier access to the United States centres of agricultural production. The Conservatives, by their short-sighted and selfish policy in defeating the Liberal Yukon Railway Scheme, destroyed Canada's chances of competing on at least equal terms with the Americans in the Yukon trade.

The imports to Eastern Canada compare as \$2,494,971 to exports \$108,345,912, a negligible quantity when we remember that these export figures represent about from one-fifth to one-quarter of our total production.

Speaking of our total agricultural trade with the United States, whether of raw material or other, we find that our agricultural imports from the United States show a sagging tendency, while our agricultural exports to them are tending upward, as the following illustrates:

## IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES.

1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
\$19,418,564	\$17,862,359	\$17,764,464	\$15,524,941	\$16,901,391

## EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.
\$5,367,973	\$7,057,172	\$7,845,696	\$7,041,180	\$8,360,700

## CANADIAN AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO ALL COUNTRIES.

1901.	1902.	1903.
\$80,276,797	\$96,313,897	\$114,441,863

## UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO ALL COUNTRIES.

1901.	1902.	1903.
\$525,613,125	\$457,867,406	\$435,862,192

We elsewhere deal in a more complete and comprehensive way with our whole import trade. If the reader will, however, once more study, in the light of the analysis we have just given, the general statement of the Conservatives, with the quotation with which this article begins, he will be in a position to make a proper estimate of the mis-statements made in the Conservative sheets and documents.

